

MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL LLP

1201 NORTH MARKET STREET
P.O. Box 1347
WILMINGTON, DELAWARE 19899-1347

302 658 9200
302 658 3989 FAX

October 10, 2007

JACK B. BLUMENFELD
302 351 9291
302 425 3012 FAX
jblumenfeld@mnat.com

PUBLIC VERSION

Original version filed: 10/10/07

Redacted version filed: 10/18/07

VIA E-FILEING AND HAND DELIVERY

The Honorable Gregory M. Sleet
United States District Court
844 N. King Street
Wilmington, DE 19801

Re: *Analog Devices, Inc. v. Linear Technology Corp.*, C.A. No. 06-346-GMS
Linear Technology Corp. v. Monolithic Power Systems, Inc., C.A. No. 06-476-GMS

Dear Chief Judge Sleet:

I write on behalf of Linear Technology Corporation ("Linear") to follow up on our September 25, 2007 letter in which we advised the Court of the September 24, 2007 Opinion of The International Trade Commission ("Commission") in *In the Matter of Certain Voltage Regulator Circuits, Components Thereof, and Products Containing Same*, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-564. The Respondent in that Investigation, AATI, has now consented to Linear's filing of the Commission Opinion under seal with this Court, subject to the Protective Order entered in this case. A copy of the Opinion is attached hereto.

As stated in our earlier letter, the Commission found that AATI violated Section 337 with respect to Linear's U.S. Patent No. 6,580,258 ("the '258 patent"). In doing so, the Commission modified claim constructions for the '258 patent that ALJ Harris had made in his Initial Determination ("ID"). Analog Devices ("Analog") and Monolithic Power Systems ("MPS") relied on ALJ Harris's claim constructions in their claim construction briefs in this Court and in their arguments at the July 26, 2007 Markman Hearing.

Specifically, Analog and MPS relied on the now-rejected claim constructions for the following disputed claim terms:

1. "substantially at the regulated voltage" (Opinion at 17-22);
2. "first state of circuit operation" (Opinion at 22-24); and
3. "second state of circuit operation" (Opinion at 22-24).

The Honorable Gregory M. Sleet
October 10, 2007
Page 2

In addition, MPS relied on now-rejected claim constructions for the following additional disputed terms:

1. “first control signal” (Opinion at 29, 41-42 and 48-49);
2. “second control signal” (Opinion at 29, 41-42 and 48-49); and
3. “third circuit” (Opinion at 28-29, 39-41 and 46-48).

The Commission also rejected ALJ Harris’s claim construction of “synchronously switched switching transistors” (Opinion at 12-17), a claim term that appears as part of the claim phrase “a pair of synchronously switched switching transistors,” which is in dispute between Linear and MPS.

Respectfully,

/s/ Jack B. Blumenfeld

Jack B. Blumenfeld (#1014)

JBB/bav
1259909

cc: Clerk of the Court (By e-filing)
All Counsel of Record (By e-filing and e-mail)

SEALED DOCUMENT